

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of November 4, 2009, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 58, 59 and 62 have been amended. Claim 75 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 32-35, 47, 50, 51, 56, 58-60, 62-64 and 71-75 are pending upon entry of the present amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested in view of the following arguments.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 34, 35, 47, 50, 51, 56, 58-60, 62-64 and 71-74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lonnroth (U.S. Patent No. 6,826,597, "Lonnroth"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 58 recites, *inter alia*,

a page generator configured to:

generate a user interface through which the request for data is made, the user interface comprising:

at least one interactive element associated with at least one command, wherein the at least one interactive element is displayed without the at least one command in the interface in a first configuration; and

a menu object displayed proximate to the at least one interactive element, wherein selection of the menu object causes a menu including the at least one command to be displayed in a second configuration,

wherein selection of the at least one command is configured to cause an operation to be applied to the at least one interactive element irrespective of whether the at least one interactive element was selected prior to the selection of the at least one command.

Support for the amended features may be found throughout the originally filed Specification. *See, e.g.*, p. 18, line 21 – p. 19, line 21. Lonnroth does not teach or suggest such features. Indeed, the Office Action does not assert that Lonnroth describes such features. At most, Lonnroth merely describes the retrieval of data using, for example, a link in an HTML document from sources that do not necessarily support the same protocols and formats as the retrieving client. *See, e.g.*, Col. 1, ll. 39-48; Col. 3, ll. 14-16. Nonetheless, Lonnroth is silent as to a user interface that includes an interactive element and a menu object displayed proximate thereto, wherein selection of a command from a menu corresponding to the menu object is applied to the

at least one interactive element irrespective of whether the interactive element was previously selected. Accordingly, claim 58 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claims 59 and 62 have been amended to recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 58 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 58.

Claims 73 and 74 are dependent on claim 58, claims 34, 35, 47, 50, 51, 56 and 60 are dependent on claim 59 and 63, 64, 71 and 72 are dependent on claim 62. Accordingly, claims 34, 35, 47, 50, 51, 56, 60, 63, 64 and 71-74 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lonroth. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 32 and 33 are dependent on claim 59. As discussed above, Lonroth fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 59. The assertion made by the Office Action that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lonroth with calendar and login services fails to cure the above noted deficiencies of Lonroth. Accordingly, claims 32 and 33 are allowable over the asserted combination for at least these reasons. Furthermore, if the Office is taking Official Notice of the above asserted facts, Applicants respectfully traverse and request proper support for such assertions.

New Claim

Claim 75 has been added. Support for the features recited therein may be found throughout the originally filed Specification. *See, e.g.*, p. 21, line 10 – p. 22, line 9.

Claim 75 is dependent on claim 62 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 62 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, claim 75 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the user interface further includes a visual focus marker configured to identify a portion of the user interface to which commands are automatically applied, wherein the commands are not applied to one or more other portions of the user interface not identified by the visual focus marker.” Lonroth fails to teach or suggest such features. Accordingly, claim 75 is allowable for at least this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: April 2, 2010

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/
Chunhsi Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001